

### **REMARKS**

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of the present application in view of the following remarks. Following entry of this response, Claims 1-21 will be pending in the application.

#### ***Objections to the Claims***

The Office Action objects to the presence of “a button number message” in claim 7 and suggests amending the claim to recite “EC\_DVDButton\_Change\_Message.” Applicants respectfully submit that the use of button number message is appropriate in claim 7. It is apparent from the text that the EC\_DVDButton\_Change\_Message is one example of a message sent in response to activation of one of the display buttons (see Specification at page 4, lines 9-19 and at page 6, line 16 to page 7, line 3). The existence of Figure 3 illustrating a particular button is simply an illustrative example in compliance with the requirement that claim elements (here, buttons) be illustrated. It will be appreciated that different messages may be used to convey information identifying a selected button and associated context and Applicants note that, in one embodiment, the Specification teaches that the message signifies that a particular button has been either selected or actuated and provides the particular button’s number (Step 120) (see page 4 lines 15-17). Therefore, Applicants submit that the use of the term “a button message” is appropriate and supported by the specification.

#### ***Rejections of the Claims under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)***

In the Office Action, claims 1-4, 6-11 and 13-21 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Kanazawa. Applicants incorporate prior arguments made in response to previous Office Actions and offer the following discussion to demonstrate the allowability of the claims.

The present invention provides a highly flexible system that adapts to provide URL information based on various contexts. Kanazawa lacks an authoring system that provides embedded commands for writing indicia of current position of play as required by the independent claims of the present application. Nor does Kanazawa disclose, anticipate, or suggest the use of a DVD text information parser as required by the claims of the present application.

Regarding independent claims 1, 9, 13 and 16, and dependent claim 3, Applicants respectfully submit that Kanazawa does not provide a DVD authored to include embedded commands for populating a general DVD register and the derivation of URLs from the authored DVD as required by the independent claims of the present application.

In the present independent claims, the authored DVD includes embedded commands, certain of which recited embedded commands write indicia of current play position into the recited DVD general parameter registers. This use of the DVD general parameter registers provides a highly flexible system in which it is possible that one DVD disk can provide a different experience for different people. A variety of content can be served to different consumers based on information including producer name, vocalist name, languages and the like as well as the current position of play (see, for example, the Specification at page 5, lines 1-20).

In contrast, Kanazawa does not disclose, anticipate or suggest the use of embedded commands or the writing of the DVD general parameter registers. Kanazawa utilizes standard DVD navigation commands to initiate display of a "Web Mark" button if a URL is associated with current display information (see Kanazawa at col. 13, line 65 through col. 14, line 8). Kanazawa employs button commands embedded in program chain information to specify URLs that are also embedded in the program chain information (Kanazawa at col. 12, lines 42-64). Thus, Kanazawa is directed to the embedding of static URLs along with the video data and, for example, would require different encodings for each language version of a DVD.

Therefore, Kanazawa cannot be said to disclose, anticipate or suggest authoring DVDs to embed commands, including commands for writing DVD general parameter registers. For at least these reasons, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejections of claims 1, 3, 9, 13 and 16.

Regarding claims 2 and 10, in addition to the arguments presented with respect to the independent claims above, Applicants submit that Kanazawa does not disclose, anticipate or suggest the use of a DVD text information parser. The Office Action suggests that a Navigation Manager that extracts URLs in text form is equivalent to the presently claimed DVD text information parser. Applicants disagree and refer the Examiner to the "Guidebook for DVD-Video Text-++ Data Usage," published by the DVD Forum, hereinafter referred to as "The DVD Forum Publication" and attached to the IDS accompanying this response. In the DVD Forum Publication, the DVD text data is described and is shown to include various registers and data

structures used by the present invention. It should become immediately apparent that DVD text data is not referenced in the Kanazawa disclosure and is not anticipated by Kanazawa.

Additionally, it will be appreciated that Kanazawa's Navigation Manager for extracting text based URLs provides no reasonable basis for finding that Kanazawa anticipates the presently claimed DVD text information parser. As noted in the Office Action, the inference of text parsing in the Navigation Manager rests on the conclusion that a URL is textual in nature. However, the inference cannot be reasonably extended to permit text parsing to encompass parsing of "DVD text information." Applicants therefore request withdrawal of the rejections of claims 2 and 10 because it cannot be reasonably held that Kanazawa discloses the use of a DVD text information parser.

Regarding claim 6, the Office Action states that the "association between the menu button and the URL being responsive to the positional playback data in the parameter register" is anticipated by Kanazawa's acquisition and processing of a NV\_PCK. Kanazawa does not teach the presence of positional playback data in a parameter register populated by embedded commands (see arguments for the independent claims above). Even if such positional playback data is available, Kanazawa reactively acquires a navigation pack (NV\_PCK) from the video unit being currently produced, in response to activation of a "Web Mark" button (see col. 16, lines 15-24). Therefore, it cannot be said that Kanazawa anticipates an association that is responsive to the positional playback data in the parameter register. Consequently, for these reasons and in addition to the arguments presented with respect to the independent claims above, Applicants request withdrawal of the rejection of claim 6.

Regarding claim 7, in addition to the arguments presented with respect to the independent claims above, Applicants submit that Kanazawa does not disclose, anticipate or suggest the use of a DVD text information parser for the same reasons presented above regarding claims 2 and 10. Additionally, Kanazawa at col. 20, lines 3 et seq. describes a web browser controlling DVD playback and does not address the URL deriving means or the media player's generating a button as required in claim 7. Because the cited passage is directed to scripting of web pages and embedding tags in web pages, it cannot be said to anticipate the elements of claim 7 directed to parsing or playing information from a DVD. Further, the event script of claim 7 cannot be equated with an HTML script as provided in the cited Kanazawa text. Therefore, for at least these reasons, Applicants request withdrawal of the rejection of claim 7.

Regarding claims 4, 8, 11 and 17-21, each of these claims are dependent claims and their allowability thus follows from the allowability of the independent claims. As such, dependent claims 4, 8, 11 and 17-21 are allowable over the art of record. Applicants submit that these claims are also allowable based on the arguments provided above and in prior office actions.

***Rejections of the Claims under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)***

In the Office Action, claims 5 and 12 stand rejected under and 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), Applicants reiterate prior arguments made in response to previous Office Actions. Applicants also note that claims 5 and 12 depend from independent claims 1 and 9, respectively and, because the allowability of these dependent claims follows from the allowability of independent claims 1 and 9 respectively, Applicants submit that claims 5 and 12 are allowable over the art of record.

***Examiner's Response to Prior Arguments***

Examiner's prior responses have been noted and addressed in the preceding discussion

***Conclusion***

All objections and rejections having been addressed, and in view of the foregoing arguments, the claims are believed to be in form for allowance, and such action is earnestly solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, he is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

Please charge any fees associated with the submission of this paper to Deposit Account Number 502213. The Commissioner for Patents is also authorized to credit any over payments to the above-referenced Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

PILLSBURY WINTHROP LLP



ANTHONY G. SMYTH, Reg. No. 55,636  
For David A. Jakopin, Reg. No. 32,995

Date: March 29, 2005  
2475 Hanover Street  
Palo Alto, CA 94304-1114  
(650) 233-4500

MOHAN -- 09/546,575  
Client/Matter: 074937-0269804



---

**CERTIFICATION UNDER 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.8 and/or 1.10\***

(When using Express Mail, the Express Mail label number is *mandatory*; Express Mail certification is *optional*.)

I hereby certify that, on the date shown below, this paper (along with any paper referred to as being attached or enclosed) is being deposited with the United States Postal Service "Express Mail Post Office to Addressee", Mailing Label No. EV382010464US, addressed to the Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450. ~~facsimile transmission to the Patent and Trademark Office, (703) 872-9314.~~

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Signature

Date: March 29, 2005

ANTHONY SMYTH

(type or print name of person certifying)

\* Only the date of filing (§ 1.6) will be the date used in a patent term adjustment calculation, although the date on any certificate of mailing or transmission under § 1.8 continues to be taken into account in determining timeliness. See § 1.703(f). Consider "Express Mail Post Office to Addressee" (§ 1.10) or facsimile transmission (§ 1.6(d)) for the reply to be accorded the earliest possible filing date for patent term adjustment calculations.